

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
OXFORD DIVISION**

WILLIE J. HARRIS

PLAINTIFF

v.

No. 3:20CV79-NBB-JMV

MARSHAL TURNER, ET AL.

DEFENDANTS

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
TO ALTER OR AMEND JUDGMENT**

This matter comes before the court on the plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the court's April 21, 2021, memorandum opinion and final judgment granting the defendants' motions for summary judgment and entering judgment for the defendants. The court interprets the motion, using the liberal standard for *pro se* litigants set forth in *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972), as a motion to amend judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e), which must be filed within 28 days of entry of judgment. An order granting relief under Rule 59(e) is appropriate when: (1) there has been an intervening change in the controlling law, (2) where the movant presents newly discovered evidence that was previously unavailable, or (3) to correct a manifest error of law or fact. *Schiller v. Physicians Res. Grp. Inc.*, 342 F.3d 563, 567 (5th Cir. 2003).

In his motion, the plaintiff merely re-urges the arguments he made in response to the defendants' motions for summary judgment. He has neither asserted nor proven any of the justifications to amend a judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). As such, the plaintiff's request to alter or amend judgment is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this, the 25th day of June, 2021.

/s/ Neal Biggers

NEAL B. BIGGERS

SENIOR U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE